National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners

Incorporated

CHERYL L. PARRINO, President Wisconsin Public Service Commission Post Office Box 7854 Madison, Wisconsin 53707-7854

BRUCE B. ELLSWORTH, First Vice President New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission

JOLYNN BARRY BUTLER, Second Vice President
Ohio Public Utilities Commission



September 16, 1996

PAUL RODGERS

Executive Director and General Counsel

GAILE ARGIRO

Treasurer

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED

SEP 1: 6' 1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIC OFFICE OF SECRETARY

William F. Caton Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: In the Matter of Telephone Number Portability
CC Docket No. 95-116 [CC Docket No. 95-116; FCC 96-286]
61 FR 38687 [7-25-96]

Dear Mr. Caton:

The National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners submits these reply comments generally supporting, inter alia, the comments filed by the New York Public Service Commission. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 requires that the costs of number portability be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis. On June 27, 1996, the Commission adopted a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) seeking comment on the appropriate methods of cost recovery of long-term number portability. New York and others filed comments in response to the FNPRM.

At its July 1996 summer meetings, NARUC passed a Number Portability Resolution in response to the FCC's FNPRM. A copy of that resolution is attached to the comments. The resolution states NARUC's support for the following positions:

- Shared industry number portability costs must be recovered from <u>all</u> telecommunications carriers, including incumbent and new local exchange carriers, interexchange carriers, and commercial mobile radio service providers, consistent with the Act;
- 2 Regional shared industry costs should be recovered on a regional basis;

No. of Copies rec'd 0+13 List A B C D E

COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE 1995-1996 YEAR

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS (1941)

Lisa Rosenblum,* New York PSC, Chair Kenneth McClure,* Missouri PSC, Vice Chair Stephen O. Hewlett, Tennessee Sharon L. Nelson,* Washington Bruce Hagen,* North Dakota Andrew C. Barrett,* FCC Preston C. Shannon, Virginia Nancy M. Norling,* Delaware David W. Rolka,* Pennsylvania James J. Malachowski, Rhode Island Charles B. Martin, Alabama Laska Schoenfelder, South Dakota G. Richard Klein, Indiana Jolynn Barry Butler,* Ohio Jean-Marc Demers, Quebec TB, Observer Cheryl L. Parrino,* Wisconsin Edward H. Salmon, New Jersey Sam I. Bratton, Jr., Arkansas Julia Johnson, Florida Don Schroer, Alaska Daniel G. Urwiller, Nebraska Irma Muse Dixon, Louisiana Joan H. Smith, Oregon Bob Rowe, Montana Vincent Majkowski, Colorado Thomas L. Welch, Maine P Gregory Conlon, California David N. Baker, Georgia Allan T Thoms, Iowa Adam M. Golodner, RUS, Observer Gloria Tristani, New Mexico SCC Doug Doughty, Wyoming Peter L. Senchuk, Canadian RTC, Observer

COMMITTEE ON ELECTRICITY (1953)

Robert W. Gee,* Texas PUC, Chair Duncan E. Kincheloe, Missouri PSC, Vice Chair Patricia S. Qualls,* Arkansas Judith C. Allan, Ontario EB, Observer Warren D. Arthur, IV, South Carolina Emmit J. George, Jr., Iowa Marsha H. Smith, Idaho Susan F. Clark, Florida James Sullivan,* Alabama Donald A Storm, Minnesota PUC Hullihen W. Moore.* Virginia Lisa Crutchfield, Pennsylvania David E. Ziegner, Indiana Lawrence B. Ingram,* New Mexico PUC Linda Breathitt, Kentucky PSC Agnes M. Alexander, District of Columbia Vicky A. Bailey,* FERC Allyson K. Duncan, North Carolina Herbert H. Tate, New Jersey Curt Hebert, Jr., Mississippi Cody L. Graves, Oklahoma Judy M. Sheldrew, Nevada Douglas L. Patch, New Hampshire Richard Hemstad, Washington Daniel Wm Fessler,* California Christine E.M. Alvarez, Colorado John O'Mara, New York PSC Brian F Bietz, Alberta EUB, Observer Constance B. White, Utah John G. Strand, Michigan Wally B. Beyer, RUS, Observer Edward J. Robertson, Ontario EB. Observer

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY CONSERVATION (1984)

Richard H. Cowart,* Vermont, Chair Renz D. Jennings,* Arizona, Vice Chair Ron Eachus,* Oregon Allan G. Mueller, Missouri Edward M. Meyers, District of Columbia William D. Cotter, New York PSC Mac Barber, Georgia Bob Anderson,* Montana Craig A. Glazer,* Ohio William M. Nugent, Maine Scott A. Neitzel, Wisconsin Karl A. McDermott, Illinois John F. Mendoza, Nevada Susan E. Wefald, North Dakota John Hanger, Pennsylvania James A. Burg,* South Dakota Susanne Brogan, Maryland William R. Gillis, Washington Andrew Rutnik, Virgin Islands Judy Hunt, North Carolina David A. Vardy, Newfoundland and Labrador BCPU, Observer Christine A. Ervin, U.S. DOE Janet Gail Besser, Massachusetts Wayne Shirley, New Mexico PSC Christine Elwell, Ontario EB, Observer Judith B. Simon, Ontario EB, Observer

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND TECHNOLOGY (1985)

Ralph Nelson,* Idaho, Chair Roger Hamilton, Oregon, Vice Chair Marcia G. Weeks, Arizona J. Terry Deason,* Florida Thomas M. Benedict, Connecticut Tom Burton, Minnesota PUC E. Mason Hendrickson, Maryland Mary Jo Huffman, Indiana Walter L. Challenger, Virgin Islands Dwight D. Ornguist, Alaska Kathleen B. Blanco, Louisiana Susan M. Seltsam, Kansas Robert J. McMahon, Delaware Gerald L. Thorpe Maryland Richard E. Kolhauser, Illinois Lowell C. Johnson, Nebraska G. Nanette Thompson, Alaska Janet Polinsky, Connecticut John C. Shea, Michigan M. Dianne Drainer, Missouri PSC Donald L. Soderberg, Nevada Rhonda Hartman Fergus, Ohio F. Anne Drozd, Ontario EB, Observer

COMMITTEE ON GAS (1963)

Ruth K. Kretschmer,* Illinois. Chair Paul E. Hanaway,* Rhode Island, Vice Chair Bruce B. Ellsworth,* New Hampshire Joshua M. Twilley, Delaware Leo M. Reinbold, North Dakota Roland Priddle, Canada, Observer Nancy Shimanek Boyd, Iowa Bob Ánthony, Oklahoma Julius D. Kearney, Arkansas Jo Ann P. Kelly, Nevada Laurence A. Cobb, North Carolina

Keith Bissell.* Tennessee Robert-Paul Chauvelot, Quebec GB, Observer John M. Quain, Pennsylvania Barry Williamson, Texas RC R. Marshall Johnson, Minnesota PUC Philip T. Bradley, South Carolina Donald F. Santa, Jr., FERC Dharmendra K. Sharma, U.S. DOT Reginald J. Smith, Connecticut A. Calista Barfett, Alberta EUB, Observer Jessie J. Knight, Jr., California Robert J. Hix, Colorado Joe Garcia, Florida Stancil O. "Stan" Wise, Jr., Georgia Steve Ellenbecker, Wyoming Frank J. Mink, Alberta EUB, Observer Harold D. Crumpton, Missouri PSC Timothy E. McKee, Kansas Clark D. Jones. Utah Richard M. Fanelly, Ohio Paul Vlahos. Ontario EB, Observer

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION (1983)

Frank E. Landis, Jr. * Nebraska, Chair Claude M. Ligon, Maryland R. Henry Spalding, Kentucky RC William A. Bailey, Kentucky RC Cecil A. Bowers, South Carolina Jerome D. Block, New Mexico SCC Joseph Jacob Simmons, III,* ICC Ralph A. Hunt, North Carolina William M. Dickson, Illinois Stephen R. Waters, Missouri Dennis S. Hansen, Idaho

COMMITTEE ON WATER (1967)

Diane K. Kiesling,* Florida, Chair Galen D. Denio, Nevada, Vice Chair Charles H. Hughes, North Carolina Robert M. Davis, Kentucky PSC Jan Cook, Alabama Mary Clark Webster Massachusetts David W. Johnson, Ohio Kate F. Racine, Rhode Island Suzanne D. Rude, Vermont Susan S. Geiger, New Hampshire Peggy Sue Garner, Texas NRCC F.S. Jack Alexander. Kansas Rod Johnson, Nebraska Carmen J. Armenti, New Jersey John F "Jack" Mortell, Indiana William Saunders, South Carolina Dorlos (Bo) Robinson, Mississippi Alyce Hanley, Alaska Henry M. Duque, California Betty Rivera, New Mexico PUC

^{*}Member of the Executive Committee of the Association

- For each carrier subject to separations, those shared industry costs recovered from that carrier, any carrier-specific number portability-specific costs, and any carrier-specific non-number portability-specific costs should be allocated between the interstate and intrastate jurisdictions using established separations procedures; and
- The FCC should develop the broadest policy guidelines possible to ensure that number portability cost recovery occurs on a competitively neutral basis while allowing the states maximum flexibility in the recovery of intrastate number portability costs.

Points 3 and 4, <u>supra</u>, suggests the FCC's tentative conclusions concerning the scope of its authority under § 251(e) (2) is in error. Section 251(e)(2) grants the FCC authority to determine the basis on which the costs associated with number portability will be borne by the carriers. Accordingly, the allocation of costs among carriers is within the purview of the FCC's jurisdiction. That authority, however, does not extend to the carrier's recovery of the intrastate portion of the number portability costs from their customers. To the extent that such cost are recovered though rates for intrastate service, such recovery is a matter subject to state jurisdiction.

Respectfully Submitted,

James Bradford Ramsay Assistant General Counsel

Number Portability Resolution

WHEREAS, The Telecommunications Act of 1996 (the Act) directs each local exchange carrier "to provide, to the extent technically feasible, number portability in accordance with the requirements prescribed by the Commission" (Section 251(b)(2)) and requires that the cost of establishing number portability "shall be borne by all telecommunications carriers on a competitively neutral basis as determined by the Commission" (Section 251(e)(2)); and

WHEREAS, The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) issued a Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (FNPRM) in CC No. 95-116 inquiring as to the appropriate cost recovery mechanisms regarding long-term number portability; and

WHEREAS, Comments and reply comments are due in that docket on August 16, and September 16, 1996, respectively; and

WHEREAS, The FCC has chosen a number portability architecture that uses regionally-deployed databases to be administered by local number portability administrator(s) chosen by the North American Numbering Council, and has determined that any state that prefers to develop its own statewide database may opt out of the designated regional database; and

whereas, The FCC has tentatively identified three types of costs involved in the provision of long-term service provider number portability: (1) shared costs incurred by the industry as a whole, such as regional database costs; (2) carrier-specific costs directly related to number portability, such as switch software costs; and (3) carrier-specific costs not related to number portability, such as network upgrades; and

WHEREAS, The FCC seeks comment on the meaning of the statutory language "all telecommunications carriers" as the term is used in Section 251(e)(2); whether the FCC has authority to exclude certain groups of carriers from the number portability cost recovery mechanisms; and, if so, which carriers should be excluded; and

WHEREAS, The FCC seeks comment on whether shared industry costs, if recovered from all carriers, should be recovered on a nationwide or regional basis; and

WHEREAS, National pooling or averaging of regional shared industry costs may reduce incentives to incur costs in the most economically efficient manner, may lead to regional cross-subsidizations, and is not necessary to ensure competitive neutrality; and

WHEREAS, National or regional pooling or averaging of carrier-specific costs may reduce incentives to incur costs in the most economically efficient manner, and is not necessary to ensure competitive neutrality; and

WHEREAS, For purposes of cost recovery, the existing separations process is the appropriate mechanism for allocation of number portability costs between interstate and intrastate jurisdictions; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC), convened at its 1996 Summer Meeting in Los Angeles, California, supports the recovery of shared industry number portability costs from all telecommunications carriers, including incumbent and new local exchange carriers, interexchange carriers, and commercial mobile radio service providers, consistent with the Act; and be it further

RESOLVED, That regional shared industry costs should be recovered on a regional basis; and be it further

RESOLVED, That, for each carrier subject to separations, those shared industry costs recovered from that carrier, any carrier-specific number portability-specific costs, and any carrier-specific non-number portability-specific costs should be allocated between the interstate and intrastate jurisdictions using established separations procedures; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the FCC is encouraged to develop the broadest policy guidelines possible to ensure that number portability cost recovery occurs on a competitively neutral basis while allowing the states maximum flexibility in the recovery of intrastate number portability costs; and be it further

RESOLVED, That NARUC authorizes its General Counsel to take any actions necessary in the FCC's number portability proceeding to further the goals enunciated in this resolution.

Certificate of Service

I, James B. Ramsay, certify that a copy of the foregoing was sent first class mail postage prepaid to all parties listed on the attacked service list.

James Bradford Ramsay

September 16, 1996